

REMARKS

Applicants request favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-10, 12, 14, 16-18 and 23-30 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 10, 19-23 and 28 being independent. Claims 8, 9, 17, 18 and 27 stand withdrawn from consideration, and Claims 6 and 15 have been canceled herein.

Claims 1, 10, 12, 23 and 28-30 have been amended. Applicants submit that support for the amendments can be found in the original disclosure, for example, at least in Figs. 5 and 6 and the corresponding description. Therefore, Applicants submit that no new matter has been added.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended in granting and conducting an interview with Applicants' undersigned representative on February 20, 2008. The substance of the discussion during the interview is incorporated into the remarks below.

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10, 12, 14-16, 23, 25-26 and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0016291 to Tojo. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

As explained during the interview, the present invention as recited in independent Claim 1, for example, is directed to an image processing apparatus for selecting key frames of moving image data. As discussed at the interview, and in the Background section of the specification, one conventional approach to selecting such key frames involves determining a difference between neighboring frames and selecting key frames based on a degree of difference between neighboring frames. However, this may result in uneven distribution of key frames throughout a single "shot," i.e., the moving data obtained from the beginning of imaging to the end of imaging. For example, if an imaging action such as panning or zooming occurs, the differences between neighboring frames may be great as a result of that action and the selected key frames may cluster around a particular object as a result of the imaging action, rather than be appropriately distributed throughout the shot.

As further explained during the interview, the present invention as recited in independent Claim 1 addresses the above-mentioned drawback of the conventional approach by providing, inter alia, the features of (i) dividing means for dividing the moving image data for one shot obtained from the beginning to the end of the imaging into a plurality of segments of the moving image data based on additional information (related to an imaging action) stored in a storage device, and (ii) selecting means for selecting a key frame of each segment divided by said dividing means based on the additional information. By dividing a single shot into segments based on the additional information and selecting a key frame for each segment based on the additional information, the invention of Claim 1 provides an advantage in that key frames are appropriately distributed throughout moving image data for one shot.

Applicants submit that the cited art fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features of Claim 1. As pointed out during the interview, Tojo merely discloses selecting a key frame for one shot based on additional information related to an imaging action. For example, Fig. 9 shows a single thumbnail associated with each shot ID. Therefore, Applicants submit that Tojo does not disclose or suggest dividing the moving image data for one shot into a plurality of segments based on the additional information, and also does not disclose or suggest selecting a key frame of each segment divided by dividing means based on the additional information.

Applicants' representative also noted during the interview that the Office Action referred to paragraph 0083 of Tojo. However, the discussion in paragraph 83 about dividing into blocks 3, relates to dividing frames into blocks in order to determine the differences between adjacent frames. It does not relate to dividing the moving image data for one shot into a plurality of segments.

Accordingly, the claimed invention recited in Claim 1 is clearly distinguishable from Tojo, is not obvious in view of Tojo, and is patentable.

The other independent claims recite features similar to Claim 1 and are believed patentable for reasons similar to Claim 1.

The dependent claims are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims, as well as for the additional features they recite.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'B. L. Klock', is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicants
Brian L. Klock
Registration No. 36,570

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
BLK/lcw

FCHS_WS 1658418_1.DOC